

along, how we can try to make this country grow and prosper in the future by recognizing that these companies do not have to just line their pockets with their profits. We do not have to measure our degree of growth in our country just by how Wall Street does, but we can look at how American workers do and how families do and whether we build up communities. That is what this individual is doing.

That is why I hope that the Congress of the United States would join with me in honoring Aaron Feuerstein and his legacy to the company that he has built, that his workers have helped him build. That means that there is going to be a happy Christmas, a happy Chanukah, a happy holiday season for so many families in Massachusetts that last week looked like they were burned out and had no hope and no future. His commitment means they do have hope, they do have a future, and all of us can learn something from his example.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman and his words, as one who is not even close to Massachusetts, but I saw it on the news. The gentleman stood up and said: All of my employees are going to continue to receive their wages, even though the plants are not operating, and we are going to start up some of those plants—I think it was—within 30 days.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is exactly right.

Mr. VOLKMER. Then soon thereafter they were going to be in full production. It is such a positive mode, just the opposite of what we have here today. This is a negative mode that we have here that we are going to reduce the Federal Government. We are going to shut it down if we do not have our way. He did not have his way. He got burned out.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. VOLKMER. I think it is a very good example of the differences in the way we just think about things.

GRANTING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just wondered if there are others that are waiting to be heard here on the floor. And those of us who are not on the list anymore, I lost my turn, I am willing to wait until all the rest of them are finished.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do, under unanimous con-

sent, is to agree to have alternating speakers, is all.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is just filling in for the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw by reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I just came upstairs from a Republican conference meeting, and it was very discouraging. There seems to be a whole lot less progress on this budget than we thought would be there.

This President has said on so many times that he was in favor of a balanced budget. During the campaign it was 5 years. Later it was 10 years, and then 8 years, and then between 7 and 9, and then 9 years, and then 7 years. And last night our leadership believed, and the press reported, that the President was prepared to put his numbers, his specific numbers for spending on the table for discussion using Congressional Budget Office numbers.

Subsequent to that, this morning the Vice President goes live on C-SPAN at the press room of the White House and, when asked that specific question, when will you have a budget, the Vice President responded, well, we will put all the budgets on the table, our OMB-scored budget, the Congress's CBO numbers, and other budgets that may be offered. And under insistent questioning by the media, he was asked, are you going to do what was said last night, put a budget on the table with CBO scoring numbers? And the Vice President said no.

This is very, very discouraging. If we cannot even get in the same rules, play in the game with the same rules, we cannot get to the end of this. Each of us would like to be home with family for Christmas and New Year's and the work that we have to do in our districts during January. But I believe we are prepared to stay through Christmas until this is done, that what we insist happening is that we are going to not go home until we have a balanced budget now.

The interesting thing about this is that we are not all that far apart. For all the talk we have heard about Medicare and gutting Medicare, we wanted to spend in year 7 on Medicare \$289 billion. The President wants to spend \$294 billion. That is not a large difference. It can be bridged easily.

We want to grow the spending in this budget by 3 percent. The President wants to grow it by 4 percent. We want to use numbers that presume an increase in revenues of 5 percent. The President wants numbers that would

presume an increase in revenues of 5.5 percent.

None of these differences are too broad to sit down at the table and just cut a deal and go home with their families for the holidays. No, this is not about numbers. This is not about numbers. This is about a basic philosophy, because we believe and have believed all year that Medicaid and welfare can be handled more efficiently and more effectively by the States. So do the Governors, including many of the Democrat Governors.

We want to take that money that we have been spending and turn it back to the States for them to handle in the community person to person, face to face. We think that welfare and Medicaid ought to be more in the form of caring than caretaking. The President disagrees. This is all about who decides, who chooses on behalf of others, who sets the power.

In 1958, John Kenneth Galbraith published a book entitled *The Affluent Society*. I always thought it was ironic that 7 years after he published a book entitled *The Affluent Society*, he enlisted in the War on Poverty. But in his book in 1958, the entire book was essentially this. It is not that Americans have too little or they have too much. But they make bad choices with their dollars. And it is the obligation of an educated government to tax those dollars from them and make better choices on their behalf.

□ 1530

I submit that is what the issue is about.

The first 2 years of the administration the budget, welfare, health care, virtually everything proposed, was for more taxes, more Federal bureaucracy, more deciding on behalf of the American citizens. Indeed Mrs. Clinton said in the house of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] one evening, "We have an obligation to make better choices on our citizens' behalf."

That is what it is about, the left versus the right. The left thinks that we should decide for the future and shape a future that our children and grandchildren will be secure in; it will be fair and warm. The right says if you gave us every lever of governance tomorrow, we would not have the slightest idea of what to do. I could not satisfy 10 percent of the Members of this House because we all come to the table with different hopes, and dreams, and aspirations.

I do know this: I could build a future that my daughter would love and my son would hate. So our side says return those choices to the people, let them keep more of the dollars in their pockets, and 260 million Americans acting in their own behalf hundreds of times every day will shape the future, and it will be one with which most of them will be happy, Mr. Speaker.

This is not about money. It is about the direction in the country. It is very

serious, and I am prepared to stay here until we are done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SHADEGG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

STOP THE REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, and Members, we just heard from the minority leader that the negotiations have broken down, that the talks, rather, that were going on to try and get this Government going have broken down. I was hopeful, but I guess I am not surprised. I am not surprised because I have kept up and watched very carefully what has been going on, and I suppose, as I thought about this, I was reminded that Speaker NEWT GINGRICH said he is a revolutionary and this is a revolution, and I suppose Speaker GINGRICH is leading a revolution, and in order to do that you must disrupt, you must block, you must impede, you must deny, you must do whatever is necessary—I guess by any means necessary—you must even take extreme means to keep anything from happening. I guess that is what revolution is all about.

It is unfortunate that the Speaker has decided to lead this revolution against the American people. Government, for all intents and purposes, has stopped. It is closed down. We cannot get a continuing resolution because the revolutionary has stopped everything.

Now I was led to believe that there were some agreements. Now, if you will recall, we got a continuing resolution that carried us up until December 15. How did they get that? They got that because there were some agreements. They got together, and the revolutionary said, "Mr. President, if you will agree to a 7-year balanced budget and CBO numbers, then we can talk," and the President, in order to get a continuing resolution so that we could keep going, we could keep Government open and get on with the negotiations, essentially agreed to that. So that is off the table, that is already agreed to, a 7-year balanced budget and CBO numbers.

So what is stopping the negotiations? The revolutionary GINGRICH also agreed that he would recognize and respect our priorities. The President said to him, "I cannot allow you to dismantle Medicare, I cannot allow you to gut Medicaid, I cannot allow you to do away with education in this country, and we must, we must, protect the environment."

And the revolutionary, NEWT GINGRICH, said, "All right, we will respect that."

So, Mr. Speaker, they came together and agreed on those basic principles in order to get to the negotiation table.

Now revolutionary NEWT GINGRICH is saying, "Unless you agree to gut Medicare and Medicaid, I don't want to play, I don't want to negotiate," and so we are past December 15 now, the Government is closed down, we cannot get a continuing resolution, and the revolutionary will not go back to the negotiating table.

That is where we are, my colleagues. That is what it is all about. I am convinced that this really is a revolution; I just did not think it would be so extreme. I never dreamed, not in my wildest imagination did I dream, that revolutionary NEWT GINGRICH would be willing to stop this country dead in its tracks in order to prove that he is a revolutionary.

So I suppose, when the veterans do not get their paychecks, when people cannot use their public parks, I suppose when people cannot get passports, when all of this is taking place, that revolutionary NEWT GINGRICH is willing to sit here and say, "That's all right, I want my way."

We have seen some of the actions of the revolutionary in the past, and we know that the revolutionary gets very upset when he does not have his way. If you can recall what happened just a few weeks ago when there was a plane that went to a most important funeral in Israel, and the revolutionary could not have his way, he came back, he pouted, he made statements, he went on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the revolutionary will stop this revolution on the people and allow Government to work.

BALANCING THE BUDGET IS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING WE CAN DO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to talk a little bit. I want to applaud my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who was here a few minutes ago when he talked about Aaron Feuerstein who runs and owns the Malden Mills in Methuen, the factory that very tragically burnt down and literally hundreds of people, thousands of people were left without a job. Several people lost their lives in that fire, and Mr. Feuerstein very generously, first, committed to rebuild the factory in Massachusetts; second, the next day told employees that they would be paid for at least 30 days and also that their health insurance would be continued for at least 90 days, and in the holiday season everyone in Massachusetts appreciated that. Even though the factory is not in my district, many of my constituents work in the that factory because it neighbors the Sixth District of Massachusetts, and I just

wanted to, first, applaud Mr. Feuerstein for what he has done. I have not met him personally, but I have called to congratulate him and offer assistance, and I think it is something that all of us nationally do across the country. Any time there is a tragedy like that, we all pull together.

I would disagree with my colleague from Massachusetts though in just what enables a very generous employer to do what was done in this particular case. In the case of the United States we have had a deficit in this country now for 26 consecutive years. If any company had run a deficit for 26 consecutive years, they could not have offered employees pay for 30 days, they probably would not even be in business. And so the situation for the United States of America is something that we have to address because instead of a one-time immediate calamity, the calamity for the United States has been a long time in coming and will not be resolved overnight.

I give people the analogy of the situation with the debt in the United States and why it is so important to balance the budget. I compare it to someone's personal finances. Imagine that you had four credit cards and you had charged the maximum amount you could on each of those four credit cards. Well, if you wanted to go and make payments, you would hope to pay down the balance, but if you, instead of doing that, you went out and applied for a fifth credit card so you could start paying the other four credit cards, it would not take someone long to figure out that indeed it would be a very quick amount of time before that fifth card was also run up and, indeed, the debt would be much, much worse.

That is very close to the situation where the United States is right now. It has borrowed and borrowed and borrowed. Now the debt is officially just below \$5 trillion, but if you add all the money that has been promised to Social Security recipients and others, the debt is even larger than that, and at some point there will not be enough money to make all those commitments which have been made, those things which are called mandatory spending, and that is why it is so important that now we take steps necessary to have a balanced budget. I am someone who believes that we could not do it in 1 year; I mean even that would be too drastic, and that is why a 7-year plan is very reasonable. If we can do it in 5, all the better, but a 7-year plan certainly would be very, very positive.

Now we are in a situation now where we are debating the 7-year balanced budget, and not too long ago we thought we had an agreement between the White House and Congress that we would use Congressional Budget Office numbers, that we would protect certain things like Medicare, education, the environment, provide for an adequate defense, provide for fair tax policy for working families, and even though we